R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 983 UD 004 725

A RE-DEFINITION OF EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OCCASIONED BY DESEGREGATION AND TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

BY- BLAKE, ELIAS, JR.

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *MODELS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *FEDERAL LEGISLATION, FEDERAL AID, RACIAL FACTORS, INTEGRATION METHODS, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, COMMUNITY RELATIONS, SCHOOL POLICY, SCHOOL ORGANIZATION, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 TITLE 4

THIS PAPER REVIEWS SOME OF THE PROBLEMS IN IMPLEMENTING TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964. THERE WAS CONFUSION ABOUT THE INTENT OF THE DIRECTIVES FOR INSTITUTES TO IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL "TO DEAL EFFECTIVELY WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS" STEMMING FROM DESEGREGATION. THE TRAINING INSTITUTES ON TEACHING THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD WHICH ASSUMED THAT TEACHERS NOW NEEDED MORE INFORMATION ABOUT INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS FOR THIS GROUP ERRONEOUSLY SUGGESTED THAT THE PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED BECAME A REALITY ONLY AS A RESULT OF DESEGREGATION. ANOTHER FOCUS WAS ON COMMUNITY REACTION TO DESEGREGATION AND WAYS OF AVOIDING VIOLENCE, CONFLICT, AND OPPOSITION. CURRENTLY, THE USE OF FUNDS HAS SHIFTED TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS OR CONSULTANTS. THE PAPER ALSO OUTLINES A SERIES OF STAGES FROM COMPLETE SCHOOL SEGREGATION TO COMPLETE INTEGRATION. THIS THEORETICAL CONTINUUM CAN HELP IN FRAMING PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING PROGRAMS AND FOR EVALUATING THEIR RELEVANCY. FURTHER, PROBLEMS OF DESEGREGATION ARE CLASSIFIED AS THEY RELATE TO COMMUNITY RELATIONS, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES, STAFF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, STUDENT INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, AND RANK ORDER OF PRIORITIES. IT IS FELT IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT TITLE IV OF THE ACT IS AIMED AT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING DESEGREGATION AND SHOULD NOT BE CONFUSED WITH TITLE VI WHICH IS CONCERNED WITH COMPLIANCE. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA'S CITIES, SPONSORED BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 16-18, 1967. (NH)

ED015983

04725

A RE-DEFINITION OF EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OCCASIONED BY DESEGREGATION and TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Prepared by
Dr. Elias Blake, Jr., Institute for Services to Education
for the
National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity
in America's Cities
sponsored by the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
November 16-18, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 004 725

In Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 entitled "Desegregation of Public Education" the mandates were clear: (1) Section 402; to authorize a report to the president and the congress on "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions" (2) Sections 403, 404, 405; to furnish technical assistance, and training institutes for school districts regarding "effective methods of coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation". Training institutes could be conducted by institutions of higher education or school boards (3) Section 407; to authorize

the attorney general to "initiate and maintain legal proceedings" in school desegregation cases when the plaintiffs are unable to do so for themselves.

These activities authorized under the Act did not receive so much attention as that part of the Equal Educational Opportunities Program (EEOP) (administratively created, not authorized by legislation as the equal employment commission) assigned to apply Title VI of the same Act to the public schools. Title VI prohibited discrimination by race, color or national origin in federally assisted programs. The political and legal battles over the school desegregation guidelines created by the EEOP overshadowed the activities of the Title IV technical assistance and training institute program. If the application of Title IV to the public schools via the guidelines has been the stick, then the Title IV institute program has been the carrot of the federal presence in public school desegregation.

Though the authorization for a survey of equal educational opportunity (The Coleman Report) was included in Title IV, the Title's main sections (404 and 405), provided for "short term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of the teachers, supervisors, counselors and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation." There is a consultant service, Section 403, but the bulk of the program is the training institutes. Section 404 institutes are held primarily on college and university campuses; section 405 institutes are operated by local

ED012283

school districts. The intent of these institutes is to build positive leadership for the process of school desegregation.

From the first planning periods for administrative guidelines there were disagreements about the meaning of "special educational problems occasioned by school desegregation." These disagreements concerned whether these were educational problems unique to desegregation as a process or whether the educational problems were standard ones intensified by desegregation. Some planners wanted the institutes to focus on changing negative attitudes of school personnel toward desegregation. Others wanted the institutes to help teachers with concrete techniques and materials appropriate in a desegregated school. These were not mutually exclusive goals but if a decision had been made following either course the administrative manual would have reflected it and in turn influenced what types of proposals came in for funding.

An analysis of the manual sent out to potential grantees indicated an attempt to leave room for a range of types of institutes and thus made the broadest possible interpretation of "problems of desegregation" <u>but with a strong tendency toward problems of the "disadvantaged"</u>. An institute could be funded for everything from helping superintendents prepare compliance plans to the development of pupil personnel programs emphasizing counseling, school attendance and health. It was never clear what degree of articulation with an actual desegregation process was required; No criteria of this sort were included. This was true for institutes funded on college and

university campuses and those funded in local school districts. It was required only that participants be in a "strategic position" to multiply the effects of the training program in a school district.

This lack of definition was based on a strategy of letting the people in the localities define problems of school desegregation. Another guiding principle was that these training institutes would work in the wake of compliance programs or an increase in the momentum of desegregation in a school system. The basic decisions to desegregate were already made and the institutes were to help with educational problems flowing from those decisions.

It is appropriate to review briefly what these institutes have been doing. This will be done in an abbreviated fashion because this paper seeks to emphasize a framework for the future rather than only an analysis of the present and past.

MAJOR CONTENT AREAS IN INSTITUTES

One of the major areas was the disadvantaged child. This area was covered against a backdrop of information about the status of race relations and school desegregation and the economic, political and psychological handicaps of Negroes in the society. These things were viewed as the causes of disadvantage. The general assumption seemed to be that with an increase in desegregation (or its onset) more teachers needed to know more about techniques and materials for teaching the disadvantaged. Such things as reading programs in elementary and secondary schools and multi-ethnic curriculum materials were covered in this area.

Another major area of content was how communities react to desegregation. Primarily these were analysis of the groups in the communities which bring pressure to bear on educators in support of or opposition to desegregation. The major concern here was how to get some degree of desegregation without violence, deep conflict, or emotional campaigns in opposition to desegregation.

The fact that this was the first continuous interracial contact for many participants generated a great deal of discussion about Negro-white relationships, what was wrong with them, and why they are as they are. In this area the strongest affective impact was generated. In the areas above the input was mainly cognitive.

STRUCTURE AND APPROACH

The typical institute was held on a college campus in the summer for a period of 3 to 8 weeks, or in a school district prior to the opening of a school. Some institutes had a winter or academic year phase but generally they were summer institutes. In the current fiscal year there has been a movement toward funding more academic year institutes.

The institutes input were highly verbal. Discussions in small groups and lectures by experts constituted the primary instructional approach. More problems were analyzed than solutions proffered. For persons moving into desegregation, however, it was undoubtedly helpful to be able to anticipate possible problems.

Though some planning of a concrete long range nature occurred it was the exception rather than the rule. Some of the

workshops, however, were quite specific about techniques and materials for the disadvantaged. Very few relationships with the teachers were continued into the regular school year, when they were back in their school districts.

Both the structure and the content were related very much to the fact that the institutes were populated primarily by teachers (about 62%, with 25% principals). It would have been inappropriate to deal with broader educational planning for desegregation with this population.

Only 13% were people with school district responsibilities rather than responsibilities for a single school as with principals and teachers.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

The picture presented to this point has been altered considerably by a move to funding consultant or technical assistance centers either on university campuses or in state departments of education. Fully half of the Section 404 funds in fiscal year 1967 are for these technical assistance centers. The program has about 6.3 million dollars in training programs this fiscal year.

It is distributed as follows:

TABLE 1: Institute Fundings Fiscal Year 1967: Title IV of Civil Rights Act, 1964

	Total	Tech. Assist. Centers	Training Institutes
Section 404 Higher Educ. Institutes	3.8 millon	1.9	1.9
Section 405 School Dist. Institutes	2.5 million	0.4	2.1
TOTALS	6.3	2.3	4.0

The technical assistance centers on the campuses of colleges or universities (usually in colleges of education) or those in State Departments can hold short term institutes as part of their technical assistance programs. Any personnel can attend, from Board members to superintendents to teachers. The other activity is to use consultants from the university, other universities in the region or school districts to aid districts with their "problems of school desegregation."

TABLE 2: Institute Fundings Fiscal Year 1966.
Title IV of Civil Rights Act, 1964

	Total	Tech. Assist. Centers	Training Institutes
Section 404 Higher Educ. Institutes	3.5 million	1.1	2.4
Section 405 School Dist. Institutes	2.7 million	.4	2.3
TOTALS	6.2	1.5	4.7

A comparison of the 1966 fiscal year funding pattern indicates the shift toward more centers. If the trend continues the next fiscal year could see most of the funds (10 million) in centers.

The development of these centers is another phase in the continuing problems of defining what this program should best do with its limited resources. These centers are designed to overcome the criticism that very little lasting assistance is given to the school districts. They also seem to assume that persons from the geographical region might be more effective in helping school districts work out their problems than "outsiders": The centers

work both with districts in the process of desegregation and those already with substantial desegregation. They can also hold short term institutes which so far have included mostly administrators; this is a good sign.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND THE EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED

One of the major assumptions in the definition of the educational problems occasioned by desegregation is that with the onset of or increase in desegregation more teachers need to be trained to work with the disadvantaged child. This assumption is based on some peculiar logic. When schools are desegregated there is not an increase in the number of disadvantaged children. They may be distributed in different schools but that does not automatically mean that teachers in these schools are ill-equipped to teach them. Someone was teaching them where they were; the new emphasis on teacher training is either an admission that both white and Negro poor have been neglected, or a substitution of the word disadvantaged for the word Negro. In either case a school system is dealing with problems occasioned by segregation and disadvantage in the case of the Negro child. It was not the intent of the Title IV legislation to reward school systems for tardy planning for the education of the poor, Negro or white.

If a school system wants to orient teachers to working with students of a race different from their own, that has nothing to do with disadvantage in the first instance. The fact that the children in the new school situation are black and white is the

first problem. It could very well happen that the Negro children also are disadvantaged, but the institute program should not get into that problem with its meager resources. To train the teacher to treat the Negro children as something called disadvantaged is dangerous at any rate, and the assumptions involved in that training probably contribute to rapid staff and school population turnover from desegregated to all black.

Only teachers in a desegregated school who are incompetent to teach the disadvantaged need the additional training.

Negro and white teachers who already are skilled in teaching all kinds of children could be concentrated in schools which might have an increase in disadvantaged students during desegregation. Then there is no need for additional training for the disadvantaged related to desegregation. If a system wants to increase its pool of such highly competent teachers, that is a separate problem.

The diagram on the following page tries to show that the number of white and Negro students a teacher has in her classroom is a separate problem from the techniques for teaching the disadvantaged. In a system already desegregating or in the early stages, few teachers would be beyond point one in the racial membership in these classes. In a sense point 7 represents the most unfamiliar new teaching situation for any teacher in a formerly segregated system and the one for which the most new training might be necessary. The new training will have to do with race regardless

of her previous experience with the disadvantaged. The middle column simply indicates that how many students are poor is a different dimension entirely. The greater the shift for either a white or Negro teacher, the greater the justification for involving them in a training program. The program would concentrate on working through attitudes and expectations about the new school setting in biracial institute groups. These should run, most ideally, throughout the academic year on a seminar basis where the problems perceived by the teachers as related to the new racial pattern can be worked through. (See School Personnel Inter-personal Relationships under Problems of Segregation).

Figure 1: Racial Membership in Class and on Faculty and Probable Need for New Training in Problems of Desegregation

	Negro Teachers			White Teachers	
	% Negro Students in Class	% white Students in Class	Possible % Disadvantaged	% Negro Students in Class	% white Students in Class
1	100	0	0 to 100	0	100
2	90	10	0 to 100	10	90
3	75	25	0 to 100	25	75
4	50	50	0 to 100	50	50
5	25	75	0 to 100	75	25
6	10	90	0 to 100	90	10
7	0	100	0 to 100	100	0

	% Negro Teachers	% White Teachers	% Negro Teachers	% White Teachers
1	100	0	0	100
2	90	10	10	90
3	75	25	25	75
4	50	50	50	50
5	25	75	75	25
6	10	90	90	10
7	1	99	99	1

The institutes, then, should leave training for the teaching of the disadvantaged to other agencies (NDEA institutes, ESEA and so on) and deal with improving education in biracial settings.

The underlying problem is that if the content in these training sessions does not deal with the disadvantaged, the institute planners seem at a loss to do anything with teachers and principals. The fact that biracial classrooms exist for the first time suggests some other kinds of training which will be outlined later.

A THEORETICAL CONTINUUM FOR STAGES OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

The following section is an attempt to outline a series of problems of desegregation and to relate them to a time line going from complete segregation to complete integration. Before looking at Figure 2 segregation, desegregation and integration will be defined:

Segregation is defined as the use of racial criteria in determining which school children should go to and to describe a situation where though racial criteria are not openly used to determine attendance, all Negroes or other minority groups attend particular schools which no other racial groups attend. This includes de facto as well as de jure segregation.

Desegregation is defined as the abolishment of racial criteria for school attendance and the actual abolishment of separate schools for racial groups whether by law or by tradition. Arrangements are in force which result in children of different racial groups actually attending schools together; desegregation is evidenced by the actual bi-racial populations in schools as opposed to the provisions allowing for the possibility of a bi-racial population in schools without the physical presence of the two races in any substantial number of schools.

Integration is defined as the absence of any racial distinctions within each school and system, whether such distinctions flow from the pressures of the administration or teachers or from the private preference of the students. All academic and nonacademic school sponsored activities are participated in by all students in each building. (In the ideal case the participation patterns are based on bi-racial peer groupings.) There is not only equal opportunity to participate, but actual participation by all groups (in some proportion) in all areas of the life of the school.

From Figure 2 it is clear that these definitions of desegregation and integration constitute points on a continuum moving from segregation to integration. The ultimate goal is complete integration as defined above. Thus these are ideal definitions representing a perfect state of complete desegregation and complete integration. The fact that the goal has been rarely achieved must not keep us from planning in a way that assumes the goal can be achieved.

Figure 2: Theoretical Segregation, Desegregation, Integration Continuum Along Which Communities in Transition May Move.

Segregation-Desegregation-Integration Continuum	Bi-racial School Relationships	Community Relationship	Physical Arrangement of Negroes and Whites
Complete Segregation	None	White-superior Negro Inferior Status	In separate school
Formal end of segregation a plan	None	Whites fearful of Negro entrance; Negroes fearful of hostile reception	In separate school
Beginning Desegregation	Negative acceptance of Negroes Little or no bi-racial interaction	Concern for vague bad events by whites; concern for survival of children by Negroes	Few Negroes in old all-white schools
Increasing Desegregation	Limited mutual classroom-only association: Focus on classwork of "disadvantaged" group	Concern for continuing quality of education by whites; pressure for compensatory programs by Negroes	Negroes in most "white schools in increasing proportions
Critical Transition Period:	Between increasing desegregation and complete desegregation a community either moves to complete desegregation and to beginning integration or, with exodus of whites from school with largest proportions of Negroes, to new de facto segregation and return to planning stage and through the same 3 stages of desegregation.		
Complete Desegregation	Participation in predominantly "Negro" and "white" school activities, limited Negro academic leadership	Mutual concern across racial lines for high quality school programs	No all Negro or all white or racially imbalanced schools
Beginning Integration	Limited participation in academic, non-academic activities at all levels in bi-racial groups	Cooperative support for specific school programs in bi-racial pressure groups	Same as 4
Increasing Integration	Bi-racial participation patterns plus some Negro Leadership in academic and non-academic life of school	Cooperative bi-racial support for specific school programs and community improvement programs	Same as 4
Complete Integration	Bi-racial participation in bi-racial peer groupings in academic, non-academic life of school	Cooperative bi-racial support plus combination business-pleasure social activities (PTA's Fund Raising)	Same as 4

Related to this theoretical continuum is a definition of the problems of desegregation which should help one decide priorities for what should be worked on first. The problems also offer a more restricted view of the kinds of things that this program should address itself to. The goal of this analysis is to have a framework for evaluating (1) whether school systems have a next step in mind beyond their current training program and (2) whether the school system is working on relevant problems given their desegregation status.

A Definition of Problems of Desegregation

Because the possible problems related to Figure 1 cover such a wide area, they are classified into five broad areas. The classification then attempts to reflect the appropriateness of the area to movement along the continuum from segregation to integration.

1. Community Relations: These problems arise from community forces which can facilitate or hinder the beginning of and progress toward desegregation. These problems are concerned with influencing the community to accept any new plan for moving from any one point on the contimuum to another point. The strategies for dealing with the community often involve the business community, civic organizations, religious groups, organized labor and parent organizations associated with the school. These are leadership groups and the hope is that they will help in the process of desegregation by leading in the development of a positive or at least a

resigned neutral attitude toward change. Problems of community relations may involve acceptance or initial desegregation in one community and the acceptance of open enrollment in another. Basically the school administration is concerned with the community reactions to movement toward complete integration from any point on the continuum. The intensity and pervasiveness of prejudice toward racial and minority groups must be carefully considered; however, community prejudice cannot be a limitation, because schoolmen must desegregate in the face of it. The intensity of prejudice influences planning and strategies, but should not stop or slow down the speed of school desegregation.

2. <u>School Administration</u> - <u>Organization Policies</u>: These are problems arising from making arrangements <u>within</u> a school system's hierarchy to facilitate smooth desegregation once the commitment is made. Some issues around which problems may arise and decisions will have to be made are: the grades and schools to be desegregated first; using the same or creating new school zones and feeder patterns to maximize desegregation; open enrollment, freedom of choice, permissive transfer, or strict geographical zones for attendance policy; transportation plans in a rural area, new bussing patterns; personnel policies for teacher assign-

ment to desegregated schools including Negro teachers in formerly segregated schools (whether they were de facto or de jure); policies for curriculum organization or grouping practices (e.g., what if it becomes apparent that ability grouping will result in within school racial separation?) The solutions to these illustrative (not definitive) problems reflect how imaginative and committed school administrations are to moving to complete integration. The options selected in this area can build into the policies of the school system practices which support continued movement toward the goal of integration; they make it easier to bring about positive changes in the new classroom and school building organizational patterns it will be easier to change their patterns of expectations.

3. School Personnel Interpersonal Relationships: The emphasis in this area is on the perceptions, motivations, prejudices or biases of teachers, principals, counselors, supervisors and other school personnel. The expectations which teachers might have about teaching in a desegregated building are dealt with. Fears and concerns which may be based on inadequate or incorrect information about the new racial group are cleared up. The relationship between teachers' expectations about achievement or a group and its actual achievement is a frequent problem. The adjustment to teaching

white or Negro children and developing professional relationships with Negro or white teachers for the first time is included in this area. The basic problem is to develop a tolerance for and willingness to work in a completely desegregated school situation and, at a further point along the continuum, to develop a staff which will work toward integration. This area is as much concerned with problems of Negro teachers as of white teachers, though to this point the role of Negro school personnel in the process of desegregation has been largely ignored. We have been more concerned with how changes affect white school personnel.

4. Student Interpersonal Relationships: This area is concerned with the problems involved in reaching and keeping a balanced participation in the school-sponsored extracurricular activities of the school. This covers the problems of developing bi-racial or minority and majority group participation in school clubs, dramatic productions, debating teams, athletic teams, school government, the school paper, subject-matter clubs (science, social studies, poetry) and all other academic and non-academic activities of a school. The problem in this area revolves around creating an atmosphere which diminishes intra-school divisions along racial and class lines. The general question to which the school people

must address themselves now is: How does one create an environment within a school which reflects the ideals of the broader society rather than its class and racial biases?

5. Desegregation and Learning Programs: This area of problems is not concerned with the disadvantaged, though they undoubtedly should benefit from programs as will be outlined here. The Title IV program probably should not put money into programs like these but should get some assurances that there is some movement in this general direction. Such programs as the non-graded school, the discovery curriculum, special art, music and drama programs, special science programs or any other truly innovative programs, are included here. The purpose is not just to innovate but to create the strongest academic program possible by system-wide standards. Ideally these programs should be found in the desegregated schools with the largest proportion of Negro students. Bluntly put white parents must see some reasons for keeping their children in a school with 20 to 30 to 50 percent Negro enrollment. Likewise Negro parents must see some educational effects of having their children moved around to go to school with whites. (It would be better if desegregation were two-way but in most cases it is the Negro child who shifts schools). Like it or not the white parents have the mobility to move out of a section of the

city or out of the city altogether. The educational programs must be too attractive to risk leaving. Also, the focus in learning is shifted to the school and its programs rather than to the child and his weaknesses or strengths. The common approach of putting in special programs for the disadvantaged without these other programs reinforces the idea of a sick or weakening school program.

Relationships Between the Problem Areas and Stages of Desegregation

Figure 3 indicates how priorities could be set based on where a school system was in its movement from segregation to integration. Underlying this figure is the idea that though all problems could be worked on at once, some take priority over others. If, as is implied throughout this section, Title IV applied some principles like these it must require some evidence from the school system which would allow it to determine the status of desegregation. The compliance program in Title VI would be invaluable in helping Title IV determine which systems seem committed to some continued change. Certainly for the approach outlined here to be effective, school districts must be willing to aim for integration. If they are not, then some of the programs proposed here cannot be justified. An assumption underlying this discussion is that the system is interested in the last steps on the scale and not simply in limited physical shifting of students. It is a waste of resources to help a school district which is willing to meet only the minimal standards for compliance. The Title VI program is more appropriate for dealing with such cases.

Point on Segregation-Integration Continuum	Priorities for Problem Areas
A. Beginning Desegregation	1. Community Relations 2. School Policies 3. Staff Interpersonal Relations 4. Student Interpersonal Relations
B. Increasing Desegregation	1. School Policies 2. Staff Interpersonal Relations 3. Student Interpersonal Relations 4. Learning Programs 5. Community Relations
c. Increasing Integration	1. Student Interpersonal Relations 2. Staff Interpersonal Relations 3. Learning Programs 4. Community Relations 5. School Policies

The figure does not intend to imply that only if the school system agrees with it would its proposal be funded. If on the other hand the district wants towork on Student Interpersonal Relationships when only a half dozen Negro students are in formerly all white schools, it should be required to give a strong defense of its school policies for substantially increased desegregation. Some indication of its efforts to gain support among community leaders also should be in evidence.

There are implications in the figure for who would be enrolled in the institute or with whom consultants from centers should confer. The top schoool administrators are the only ones of sufficient authority to develop a community relations program or work out the overall plans or school policies. As a part of their planning they could work out a tentative program for getting Negro and white staff started to working on biracial staffs (part of Staff Interpersonal Relations) and into teaching workshops

to probe their attitudes and expectations about working with students of the opposite race. A teaching workshop means an opportunity to teach a biracial class and a chance to review their performance with an astute observer of behavior.

The figure also illustrates how it is necessary to take up problems from the same area at a different stage. It is clear that school administrators need to develop some community support to initiate desegregation in a completely segregated system. The need, however, may not seem as evident after the first steps are "accepted." If new learning programs are started in the biracial schools with the largest minorities of Negroes, these too need selling in the immediate communities from which the schools draw. The same thing would be true if a staff set out in C of Figure 3 to identify talented Negro youth and to encourage them to join academic clubs, newspaper staffs, choral groups in the same proportions in which they play on athletic teams.

Given the legislative history of Title IV in regards to racial balance, some would argue that no activity can be funded beyond "complete desegregation" on the continuum in Figure 1. Be that as it may, Title IV could still require sound evidence of what a school system intends to do to avoid resegregation. Resegregation is occurring in major southern cities, e.g., Nashville, Atlanta, Little Rock. Atlanta's first year of desegregation was as late as 1961. And it now has a majority Negro school enrollment (57% Negro, 43% white). Maybe Atlanta will become the Washington, D.C. of the South, and there is nothing to be done about it. But if Title IV funds are

used in such a system, it certainly ought to be required to say what it has in mind for the schools with 10 to 50 percent Negro enrollment.* The people in its training institutes should come from those schools and some records ought to be kept on whether any trend toward resegregation slows down.

The picture is much more hopeful for applying a scheme like the one here to Little Rock and Nashville, where Negroes constitute 33 and 23 percent of the school populations.

The goal is to force long range planning for desegregation. There are a great many school districts across the South with 15 to 35 percent Negro populations, and not so rigid neighborhood segregation. It may well be that with so few funds Title IV can only stimulate long range planning, in addition to aiding in carrying out immediate plans. Both immediate and long range plans should be a condition of funding. The relationships between the status of desegregation and problems of desegregation is a framework for bringing some order to what Title IV might conceivably do.

THE THEORETICAL SCHEME AND THE POLITICAL REALITIES

The paper has purposely ignored the political "realities". These realities surround a Federal program designed to aid a process for which the society has shown no stomach in 13 years. If one thinks about the ways in which such a program can be gutted or destroyed in this political period, one's pessimism is likely to overpower one's sense of the possible; reason is replaced with despair. There already are some signs that Title IV may become a mere appendage of the Title VI compliance program. putting out

*Nashville has 7 formerly all-white schools with a Negro enrollment of 51 to 75%.
Atlanta has 6 formerly all-white schools with a Negro enrollment of 51 to 100%.
Little Rock has 1 formerly all-white school with a Negro enrollment of 61%.
From the Southern Education Report, 1967.

desegregation brush fires around the country. By this I mean helping the compliance program persuade recalcitrant or footdragging districts, by making training funds available; this is just the opposite of how Title IV should use its resources.

With so few funds, Title IV should be looking for the promising school districts, which show some signs of going beyond the letter of the guidelines. And where the top administrators are interested in developing a first rate school system equal to the second half of the twentieth century. The Title also should be probing ideas of districts interested in availing themselves of the program's services. It is not too difficult to find the limits of tolerance a school district has for a change. If a district is only interested in a smooth process of tokenism in faculty desegregation, and balks at the idea of seriously projecting when there will be Negro principals or supervisors in biracial schools and where those schools are likely to be located and how it might get to that point, Title IV probably ought to do business elsewhere.

Somewhere we have to have models of what is possible and Title IV seems to be the only source of funds for model planning and <u>execution</u> in the Federal arsenal of funds. This is stated in full knowledge of the bussing experiments and the planning grants for educational parks. Beneath the planning some funds are needed for training school personnel so that they see the need for such radical changes. Funds are needed to hold the best staffs in schools threatened this year by resegregation so that these staffs will still be there and committed to teaching <u>all</u> children when the parks come about.

If Title IV becomes too deeply involved in the compliance program it is going to share the political and financial hardships of that program. The relationship between the two should be one whereby Title VI helps Title IV identify the promising areas in which to stimulate better long range planning for more desegregation. These cooperative districts are less likely to bring this program under heavy political fire. If the program defines its efforts, orders its priorities, and encourages some planning beyond the current school year, it might well become a well financed major force in long range desegregation efforts. In the long run there could be an inverse relationship between Title VI and Title IV in school desegregation. As Title VI becomes smaller because compliance (as it is politically feasible to define it) is less and less a problem, Title IV could become a larger force in the field, to show that it is not always necessary to go the way of Washington or Manhattan or of Atlanta in school desegregation.

It would be sad indeed if after all the years of effort this Title had not shown that at least in a few places around the country integration can happen if there is the foresight and the will.